

REMARKS

Claims 6-10, 16-20, 26-31, 33, 35-39, 41-45, 47, and 48 are pending in the present application and stand rejected in the office action dated March 25, 2010 (hereinafter “current office action”). In the current response, independent claims 31, 37, and 43 and dependent claims 35, 36, 38, 41-42, and 47-48 have been amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

At the outset, Applicants would like to point out that there is no apparent consideration in the instant Office Action of some of the remarks made in Applicants’ response (dated January 19, 2010) to the previous Office Action (dated October 16, 2009). Thus, it is not known if the remarks provided in the January 19, 2010 response were considered and found not persuasive, or, at least in part, overlooked.

In particular, in the January 19, 2010 response, Applicants explained that the cited art did not disclose or suggest rejected claimed subject matter by pointing out numerous distinctions between the claims and the cited art, using specific examples and citations. More specifically, the remarks not addressed were related to Applicants’ amendment of claims 31 and 37 “wherein the in-process provider keeps track of unmanaged data that is referenced from a managed space and prevents access of the unmanaged data outside a managed execution frame,” and remarks regarding dependent claims 33, 39, and 45 addressing the differences of ADO and ADO.net. In the instant Office Action however, the same art is used to support rejection of the same claimed subject matter, without consideration or a response to Applicant’s previous remarks. Applicants request consideration of remarks herein.

Drawings

The drawings have not been affirmatively accepted in any of the office actions thus far. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner affirmatively accept the drawings.

IDS

A supplementary IDS was submitted on 8/31/2009 and the examiner did not sign-off on all references (specifically No. 6 thru 9). Applicants request Examiner to sign-off on all references. Applicants have included an NPL document for reference 9. Documents 6 thru 8 were included in a previous IDS/NPL submission.

Claim Objections

Claim 31 and 37 were objected to in the office action because of alleged informalities of adding a limitation which was not underscored. Applicants have underscored “a subsystem for separating the .NET managed code into an immutable part and a mutable part;” and “separating the .NET managed code into an immutable part and a mutable part;” in order to advance prosecution. Applicants request withdrawal of the objections.

Examiner Interview

The Applicants’ undersigned attorney wishes to thank Examiner Pannala for taking the time to conduct an interview on August 6, 2010. During the interview, the objection to the Section 103 rejection was discussed as well as the Examiner’s Amendment in the previous notice of allowance. Regarding Section 103, the undersigned discussed differences in the cited art and Applicants’ invention. No agreement was reached. A separate applicant-initiated interview summary was submitted.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6-10, 16-20, 26-31, 35-38, 41-44, 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srivastava (US Patent 6,735,598) hereinafter Srivastava, in view of Stawikowski (US Patent 7,159,007) hereinafter Stawikowski, and in view of Pandya (US Patent 7,376,755) hereinafter Pandya.

Claims 6-10, 16-20, 26-31, 35-38, 40-43,44, 46-48

The claims are directed to executing .NET managed code in a database management system that affords the acknowledgment of the invocation context and how it is exposed and

made available to end users, the separation of immutable and mutable parts of a request, the utilization of an in-process provider in exposing a client's connection; and other attributes which, among other things, allow for easier use and higher efficiencies.

The office action asserts that Srivastava teaches the exposing of a client's connection context through the utilization of an in process provider, that Stawikowski teaches invoking an invocation context in the database server, and that Pandya teaches an invocation context comprises providing access to a client's connection context. However, Applicants traverse each of these rejection and respectfully request reconsideration thereof based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

In-proc Provider

Claim 31, claim 37, and claim 43, as amended, recite *exposing the context class to the database server through the utilization of an in-process provider*. As amended, without prejudice or disclaimer regarding the assertions of the office action, Applicants believe the office action rejection is moot.

The office action asserts that Srivastava's dynamic linking of a database server to a subclass at the time the code is executed as teaching the utilization of an in process provider. Srivastava's dynamic link to a subclass does not teach or suggest exposing the client's connection context to the database server. In particular, a dynamic link to a subclass is not maintained within the managed memory of the .NET process as achieved by an in-process provider and nowhere does Srivastava teach that the client's connection context is exposed via the dynamic link. In other words, Srivastava's dynamic link to a subclass does not infer that the context class is exposed.

However, without prejudice or disclaimer regarding the assertions of the office action, Applicants also made the following claim amendment in the previous office action: “*wherein the in-process provider tracks unmanaged data that is referenced from a managed space and prevents access of the unmanaged data outside a managed execution frame.*”

Nowhere does Srivastava teach an in-process provider much less an in-process provider exposing a context class to a database server, and/or an in-process provider that keeps track of unmanaged data that is referenced from a managed space and prevents access of the unmanaged data outside a managed execution frame.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Srivastava does not teach exposing the context class to the database server through the utilization of an in-process provider. Accordingly, because the claims are patentably distinct over the cited references, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 31, 37, and 43.

Invocation Context

Claims 31, claim 37, and claims 43, as amended, recite “***a context class, wherein the context class contains information comprising a connection context of a client, a command context of the client, a transaction context of the client, a pipe context of the client, and a trigger context of the client.***”

The office action admits that Srivastava and Stawikowski do not teach connection, triggers, and transaction context of the clients as stated in claims 31, 37, and 43. Pandya does not teach this feature either.

Pandya’s invention refers to reducing the TCP/IP overhead from a host processor and enabling a data transport solution based on internet protocol (IP). *See Pandya Column 1, Line 55-60*. Nowhere does Pandya teach or suggest the claim element. Simply writing data packet flow and queuing the packets for transmission, *See Pandya Figure 34, Column 33, Line 55 to Column 34, Line 18*, does not result in the invoking of an invocation context much less an invocation context based on at least a context class, as in the amended claims. In contrast to anything described in Pandya, the recited “invoking an invocation context in the database server, wherein the invocation context is based on at least a context class” accounts for problems such as certain data access operations only being valid if run under the caller’s context (*e.g.*, access to inserted and deleted pseudo-tables or lock sharing). *See Specification [0047]*. Pandya’s mere description of writing data packet flow and queuing the packets for transmission does not teach the recited invocation context or invoking of such invocation context and is unrelated to the claimed concept.

Without prejudice or disclaimer, claim 31, 37, and 43 have been amended to recite invoking an invocation context in the database server, wherein the invocation context “is based on at least a context class, wherein the context class contains information comprising a connection context of a client, a command context of the client, a transaction context of the client, a pipe context of the client, and a trigger context of the client.” Pandya does not teach

invoking an invocation context as amended and, as such, does not teach that the invocation context based on at least a context class.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 31, 37, and 43.

For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that Srivastava fails to teach or suggest the subject matter of amended claims 31, 37, and 43 and Stawikowski and Pandya fails to supply the missing features. Thus, no combination of Srivastava, Stawikowski, and Pandya will produce the claimed invention. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection of independent claims 31, 37 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn. Inasmuch as dependent claims 6-10, 16-20, 26-30, 33, 35-36, 38-39, 41-42, 44-45, 47, and 48 depend from one of the independent claims 31, 37 and 43, they too are believed to be allowable for at least the same applicable foregoing reasons.

Dependent Claims 33, 39, 45 – ADO.net

Claims 33, 39, and 45 recite that the client from independent claims 31, 37, and 43 is a .NET application and the in-process provider is an ADO.net in-process provider.

The office action asserts that dependent claims 33, 39, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srivastava in view of Stawikowski and in view of Woodring (U.S. Patent 7,020,660), where Woodring is cited as teaching ADO.net. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 33, 39, and 45 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable independent claims 31, 37, and 43, respectively. However, without prejudice or disclaimer, Applicants respectfully submit that Woodring does not teach ADO.net as submitted by the office action.

Applicants concede that Woodring teaches **ADO**. However, Woodring does not teach **ADO.net**, a distinct difference from ADO. For example, as distinguished in Applicants' Specification, "ActiveX Data Object (ADO) is an application program interface from Microsoft that lets a programmer writing Windows applications get access to a relational or non-relational database from both Microsoft and other database providers." (*Specification-Paragraph [0007]*). In contradistinction to Woodring and ADO, "ADO.net is a set of classes in .NET that allows for data access. ADO.net is comprised of classes found in the

System.Data namespace that encapsulate data access for distributed applications. However, rather than simply mapping the existing ADO object model to .NET to provide a managed interface to OLEDB and SQL Server, ADO.net changes the way data is stored and marshaled within and between applications.” (*Specification-Paragraph [0009]*).

Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection of dependent claims 33, 39 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn because although Woodring teaches ADO it does not teach or suggest ADO.net which is separate and distinct from ADO.

CONCLUSION

By the remarks and the amendments provided herein, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action mailed March 25, 2010 has been traversed and that the application is in condition for allowance. Any amendments made during prosecution are without abandonment of subject matter. Applicants expressly reserve the right to, in the pending application or any application related thereto, reintroduce any subject matter removed from the scope of claims by any amendment and introduce any subject matter not present in current or previous claims. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 6-10, 16-20, 26-33, 35-39, 41-45, 47, and 48. If the Examiner has any concerns regarding the response provided herein, or wishes to discuss the response further, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency, charge any additional fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, associated with this application in connection with this filing, or any future filing, submitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office during the pendency of this application, to Deposit Account No. 23-3050.

Date: September 24, 2010

/Craig L. Cupid/
Craig L. Cupid
Registration No. 61,308

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439